UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 09/912,696 | 07/24/2001 | Christian C. Landry | COMP:0244 P01-3660 | 6978 |

7590 11/19/2002

Robert A. Van Someren
Fletcher, Yoder & Van Someren
P.O. Box 692289
Houston, TX 77269-2289

| EXAMINER |
|---|
| VORTMAN, ANATOLY |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2835 | |

DATE MAILED: 11/19/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|---|---|---|
| | 09/912,696 | LANDRY ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Anatoly Vortman | 2835 |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *24 July 2001* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-59* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-59* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *24 July 2001* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) *2,3* .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Drawings*

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the horizontal mount structure recited in claim 12, and an angular lock assembly recited in claim 13, must be shown. No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-15, 17, 18, 20-26, 28-47, 49-55, and 57-59, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US/6,006,243 to Karidis.

Regarding claim 1, Karidis disclosed (Fig. 4) a computer system comprising: a component housing comprising: a first section (74); and a second section (76) rotatably coupled to the first section (74); and a display (72) rotatably coupled to the component housing.

Regarding claim 20, Karidis disclosed a space saving system (Fig. 4) for a computing device, comprising: a display (72); and a housing (74, 76) rotatably coupled to the display (72), wherein at least a portion (76) of the housing is rotatable to an upright position.

Regarding claim 32, Karidis disclosed a computer structure (Fig. 4) , comprising: a body comprising a plurality of rotatably coupled sections (74, 76) configured for geometrical adaptation to a desired environment, wherein the plurality of rotatably coupled sections (74, 76) are configured to support computing components (77) including the display (72).

Regarding claims 2, 22, and 33, Karidis disclosed that component housing comprises a flat panel housing (panel housing sections 74 and 76).

Regarding claims 3-6, 23, and 24, Karidis disclosed that said component housing comprises a computing circuitry comprising: a processor, a memory, and a mobile power supply (column 5, lines 45-63).

Regarding claims 7-10, 25, and 26, Karidis disclosed that said computer system further comprising a wireless communication system represented by a removable wireless keyboard and a pointing device (column 3, lines 31-40).

Regarding claims 11 and 12, Karidis disclosed a support structure (78, 88, 90) including a horizontal mount structure (88, 90) for supporting an angular orientation of the second section (76) relative to the first section (74).

Regarding claim 13, Karidis disclosed an angular lock assembly for securing the component housing in a desired relative angle between the first section and the second section (column 4, lines 62+; column 5, lines 1+).

Regarding claims 14,15, 21, and 28, Karidis disclosed a connector assembly (80) for rotatably coupling the display (72) and the component housing.

Regarding claims 17 and 18, Karidis disclosed a mount assembly (88, 90) and an electrical coupling assembly (84, 86) configured for removably coupling the display to the component housing (74), (Fig. 4).

Regarding claim 29, Karidis disclosed a support structure (78, 88, 90) for supporting at least the portion (76) of the housing in the upright orientation.

Regarding claims 30, 31, 34, and 35, Karidis disclosed that the housing comprises rotatably coupled sections (74, 76) configured for plurality of angular orientations and geometrical configurations, including a base section (74) and a rotatable section (76).

Regarding claims 36 and 37, Karidis disclosed that the plurality of geometrical configurations includes a folded configuration (Fig. 5) with flat arrangement of the rotatably coupled sections (74, 76) and a zigzagging configuration, (Fig. 4).

Regarding claim 38, Karidis disclosed a display panel assembly (72), the plurality of geometrical configurations comprising a working configuration having a display panel (72) positioned at a desired viewing orientation for the display and having at least a portion (74) of the housing assembly positioned at a desired orientation for mounting on a surface, (Fig. 4).

Regarding claims 39, 40, and 41, Karidis disclosed a first housing panel (74), a second housing panel (76) rotatably coupled to the first housing panel (74), and a display panel (72) rotatably coupled by a coupling assembly (80) to the second housing panel (76), (Fig. 4).

Regarding claim 42, Karidis disclosed that at least a portion of the computer components (column 5, lines 45-63) integrally coupled within the plurality of rotatably coupled sections (74, 76), wherein the computer components comprise a display (72) and a processor, and the display (72) includes a panel display screen, (Fig. 4).

Regarding claims 43-47, 49-55, and 57-59, the method steps recited in the claims, are inherently necessitated by the device structure as disclosed by Karidis.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 16, 27, and 56, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karidis in view of US/6,015,120 to Sweere et al., (Sweere).

Regarding claims 16 and 27, Karidis disclosed all of the claims limitations as applied to claims 15 and 20 respectively, but did not disclose that the connector assembly comprises a

connector structure having a first and a second rotatable assemblies disposed on opposed ends of the connector and connected to the housing and to the display, respectively.

Sweere disclosed (Fig. 1 and 2) a display mounting structure having a connector comprising a first (18, 22, 98) and a second (30, 32, 34, 36) rotatable assemblies disposed on opposed ends of the connector (114) and connected to the housing (12, 14) and to the display (16), respectively.

Since the inventions of Sweere and Karidis are from the same field of endeavor (computers), the purpose of the connector structure disclosed by Sweere would be recognized in the invention of Karidis.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the computer art at the time the invention was made to modify the mounting of the display of Karidis by providing said mounting with the connector structure having two rotatable assemblies as taught by Sweere, in order to facilitate adjustments of the display by a user.

Regarding claim 56, the method steps recited in the claim are inherently necessitated by the device structure as disclosed by Karidis and Sweere.

6. Claims 19 and 48, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karidis in view of US/5,260,884 to Stern.

Regarding claim 19, Karidis disclosed all of the claim limitations as applied to claim 1, but did not disclose a handle assembly coupled to the component housing.

Stern disclosed (Fig. 1) a portable computer system having a component housing (14) with an integral handle (11) attached thereon.

Since the inventions of Karidis and Stern are from the same field of endeavor (computers), the purpose of the handle disclosed by Stern would be recognized in the invention of Karidis.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the computer art at the time the invention was made to provide the component housing of Karidis with the integrally formed handle as taught by Stern, in order to facilitate carrying of the device.

Regarding claim 48, the method steps recited in the claim, are inherently necessitated by the device structure as disclosed by Karidis and Stern.

***Conclusion***

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

US/5229757, 5666694, 5416730, 5268817, 5719799, 5383138, 6353529, 5278779, 6392871, 5260885, 5247285, JP/5-257568, JP/4-281509, and JP/8-54962 disclosed computer systems with sectionalized component housings.

US/5241303 and 5646820 disclosed computer systems with removable input devices (keyboards).

US/5871094 disclosed portable computer case with integrally formed carrying handle.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anatoly Vortman whose telephone number is 703-308-7824. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00, Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Darren Schuberg can be reached on 703-308-4815. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-3431 for regular communications and 703-305-3432 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1782.

Anatoly Vortman
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2835

A.V.
October 3, 2002